	li .		
1	KATHY E. MOUNT, SBN 104736		
2	TERRY ROEMER, SBN 151894 MEYERS, NAVE, RIBACK, SILVER & WILSON 555 12th Street, Suite 1500		
3	Oakland, CA 94607 kmount@meyersnave.com		
4	Phone: (510) 808-2000 Facsimile: (510) 444-1108		
5	Attorneys for Defendants		
6	City of Pittsburg, Chief of Police Aaron Baker, Capt. William Zbacnik, Lt. Michael Barbanica,		
7	Lt. William "Brian" Addington, Lt. Wade Derby		
8			
9	UNITED STATES [
10	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
11			
12	RON HUPPERT and JAVIER SALGADO,	Case No.: C 05-01433 JL	
13	Plaintiffs, v.	SEPARATE STATEMENT OF UNDISPUTED MATERIAL FACTS IN	
14	CITY OF PITTSBURG, CHIEF OF POLICE	SUPPORT OF DEFENDANTS CITY OF PITTSBURG, AARON BAKER,	
15	AARON BAKER, CAPT. WILLIAM ZBACNIK, LT. MICHAEL BARBANICA, LT. WILLIAM	WILLIAM ZBACNIK, MICHAEL BARBANICA, WILLIAM ADDINGTON	
16	"BRIAN" ADDINGTON, LT. WADE DERBY, and DOES 1-40,	AND WADE DERBY'S MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDMENT OR IN THE	
17	Defendants.	ALTERNATIVE MOTION FOR	
18	Delendants.	SUMMARY ADJUDICATION OF CLAIMS ASSERTED BY PLAINTIFF SALGADO	
19		DATE: August 2, 2006	
20		TIME: 9:30 a.m. DEPT: Courtroom F, 15th Floor	
21		Complaint Filed: April 7, 2005	
22			
23	Defendants City of Pittsburg, Chief of P	olice Aaron Baker, William Zbacnik, Michael	
24	Barbanica, William Addington, and Wade Derby submit the following statement of		
25	undisputed material facts, together with references to supporting evidence, in support of		
26	their motion for summary judgment or, in the alternative, summary adjudication of claims		
27	asserted by Plaintiff Javier Salgado.		

28

1		UNDISPUTED MATERIAL FACTS	SUPPORTING EVIDENCE
2	1.	3	Declaration of Marc Fox ("Fox Decl.") ¶ 2
3		employed by the City of Pittsburg as a police officer on April 9, 1995.	Decl.") ¶ 2
4			NOT DISPUTED BY PLAINTIFF
5	2.	9	2. Fox Decl. ¶ 2
6		police officer during his entire period of employment with the City of Pittsburg.	NOT DISPUTED BY PLAINTIFF
7	3.	In or about September - October 2001, Chief	Declaration of Kathy Mount
8		Baker assigned Salgado and Ron Huppert	("Mount Decl.") Exhibit A
9		to investigate allegations of wrongdoing by police officers at the City golf course. All	(Salgado Depo. Tr. 142:21- 143:6); Declaration of Aaron
10		reports and information Huppert provided to the Police Chief and City Manager regarding	Baker (Baker Decl.)¶ 3
11		that investigation were pursuant to	NOT DISPUTED BY PLAINTIFF
12		Salgado's official responsibilities as a police officer.	
13	4.	In October 2001, Salgado and Huppert	4. Baker Decl. ¶ 8; Exhibits A,B,C
14		submitted memos to Chief Baker reporting their findings regarding the golf course	NOT DISPUTED BY PLAINTIFF
15		investigation.	NOT DISPUTED BY PLAINTIFF
16	5.	Salgado testified in his deposition that, in	5. Mount Decl., Exhibit A
17		2002, Defendant Michael Barbanica ordered the police officers not to bail out Officer	(Salgado Depo. Tr. 127:7- 134:10)
18		Reuben Vasquez, a Hispanic police officer,	,
19		when he was put in jail overnight. However, Salgado testified that he was aware of at	DISPUTED BY PLAINTIFF
20		least four other instances of police officers who were jailed and not bailed out by fellow	
21		officers – one such officer was Caucasian and three other officers were African-	
22		American.	
23	6.	Salgado testified in his deposition that, in	6. Mount Decl., Exhibit A
24		February 2002, Defendants Barbanica and Addington accused him of being in a	(Salgado Dep. Tr. 158:23- 165:1)
25		vehicular pursuit that Salgado was not	,
26		involved in, in retaliation for Salgado's report of the golf course investigation. However,	NOT DISPUTED BY PLAINTIFF
27		the matter was "dropped" and no disciplinary	
		action was taken against Salgado related to this incident.	
28	Senar	ate Statement of Undisputed Material Facts in	Huppert/Salgado v. City of Pittsburg e

1 2 3 4 5 6 7	7. In March 2002, Salgado and Huppert were assigned to patrol City refineries. Their assignment was to drive in and around the refineries looking for suspicious persons. Salgado testified in his deposition that he was given no training regarding how to handle a chemical leak at the refineries. However, it was not part of his duties to handle chemical leaks. He had been told by Barbanica that, if there was a leak, they should "get the hell out of there."	7. Mount Decl., Exhibit A (Salgado Depo. Tr. 259:14- 263:15) DISPUTED BY PLAINTIFF
8 9 10	8. In late 2003 or early 2004, the police department initiated an internal affairs investigation and criminal investigation into alleged falsification of police records by police officer Jim Hartley, a Caucasian.	8. Mount Decl., Exhibit A (Salgado Depo. Tr. 82:13-15); Baker Decl. ¶¶ 4,5 NOT DISPUTED BY PLAINTIFF
11 12 13 14	9. Hartley resigned from employment before the internal affairs investigation was completed.	9. Baker Decl. ¶ 5; Mount Decl. Exhibit A (Salgado Depo. Tr. 83: 9-15) NOT DISPUTED BY PLAINTIFF
15 16 17	Officer Hartley was subsequently convicted of felonies for falsifying police reports.	10. Baker Decl. ¶ 5; Mount Decl., Exhibit A (Salgado Depo. Tr. 83: 6-8)
18 19 20 21 22	11. In light of the concern over Hartley's report writing improprieties, Chief Baker decided to have an audit done of all the department's police reports regarding "under the influence" arrests to determine whether other officers had engaged in "cutting and pasting" information from one report to another.	11. Baker Decl. ¶ 6 NOT DISPUTED BY PLAINTIFF
23 24 25 26 27	 12. Sergeant Steiner and Lieutenant Wade Derby conducted the audit of those police reports. The audit revealed that Salgado had several reports that had been "cut and pasted." 13. After learning the results of the audit, Chief Baker decided to commence both a criminal 	12. Baker Decl. ¶ 6; Mount Decl., Exhibit A (Salgado Depo. Tr. 81: 14-82:1; 82:16-83:2) DISPUTED BY PLAINTIFF 13. Baker Decl. ¶ 7
28	investigation and an internal affairs Separate Statement of Undisputed Material Facts in	DISPUTED BY PLAINTIFF Huppert/Salgado v. City of Pittsburg,

1 2	investigation into Salgado's report writing improprieties.	
	14. Chief Baker chose Lieutenant Barbanica to	14. Baker Decl. ¶ 7
3	conduct the internal affairs investigation and Lieutenant Addington to conduct the criminal	DISPUTED BY PLAINTIFF
4	investigations. In consultation with the District Attorney's office, Chief Baker	
5	determined that it was not inappropriate for Addington to conduct this investigation even	
6	though he had reviewed and approved some of Salgado's police reports.	
7	15. The internal affairs investigation concluded	15. Baker Decl. ¶ 9
8	that Salgado had falsified police reports.	· ·
9		NOT DISPUTED BY PLAINTIFF
10	16. Based on the IA report, Chief Baker decided	16. Baker Decl. ¶ 9, Exhibit E
11	to initiate termination proceedings against Salgado. The reasons for his termination	DISPUTED BY PLAINTIFF
12	were as stated in the "Notice of Proposed Disciplinary Action," dated July 15, 2004,	
13	which was given to Salgado.	
14	17. On or about July 15, 2004, Salgado was	17. Baker Decl. ¶ 10, Exhibit E;
15	provided with written Notice of Proposed Disciplinary Action which proposed	Mount Decl., Exhibit A (Salgado Depo. Tr. 98:19 -
16	termination, the reasons therefore, a copy of	99:3)
17	the materials on which the proposed action was based, and was informed of his right to	NOT DISPUTED BY PLAINTIFF
18	respond, either orally or in writing, to the charges.	
19	18. Chief Baker set a date for the Skelly hearing	19 Paker Deal ¶11
20	for July 23, 2004, at which Salgado could present his response to the Chief regarding	18. Baker Decl. ¶ 11
21	the charges in the Notice of Proposed	DISPUTED BY PLAINTIFF
	Disciplinary Action. However, Salgado and his attorney failed to appear at the	
22	scheduled time for the Skelly hearing.	
23	19. During July 2004, City Manager Marc Grisham was on vacation. Chief Baker was	19. Baker Decl. ¶ 12
24	appointed Acting City Manager for the	NOT DISPUTED BY PLAINTIFF
25	period of time Mr. Grisham was on vacation.	
26	20. Having not heard from Salgado on July 23 rd , Chief Baker concluded that Salgado had	20. Baker Decl. ¶ 12
27	waived his right to a Skelly hearing.	DISPUTED BY PLAINTIFF
28		

1	21. On July 26th, Baker issued a Notice of Disciplinary Action to Salgado.	21. Baker Decl. ¶ 12, Exhibit F
2		NOT DISPUTED BY PLAINTIFF
3	22. On July 26, 2004, Chief Baker received a letter from Salgado's attorney, Matthew	22. Baker Decl. ¶ 13
4 5	Pavone, complaining that Salgado had not been given an adequate opportunity for a	NOT DISPUTED BY PLAINTIFF
6	Skelly hearing.	
	23. Chief Baker decided to withdraw the July 26 th Notice of Disciplinary Action and defer	23. Baker Decl. ¶ 13; Exhibit G;
7	the matter to the City Manager, Marc	Mount Decl., Exhibit A (Salgado dep. Tr. 99:13-102:6)
8	Grisham, for a final decision when he returned to the office on August 2, 2004. On	(Saigado dep. 11. 99.19-102.0)
9	July 27, 2004, Chief Baker sent a letter to Mr. Pavone explaining his actions.	NOT DISPUTED BY PLAINTIFF
10	·	
11	24. City Manager Grisham conducted a Skelly hearing on August 11, 2004, at which	24. Baker Decl. ¶ 14; Mount Decl., Exhibit A (Salgado dep. Tr.
	Salgado presented his response to the	99:13-102:6; 106:5-21; 108:12-
12	charges contained in the July 15 th Notice of Proposed Disciplinary Action.	109:9)
13 14		DISPUTED BY PLAINTIFF
	25. On or about August 24, 2004, Mr. Grisham	25. Baker Decl. ¶ 14, Exhibit H.;
15	issued a notice of disciplinary action to Salgado, which set forth the grounds for	Mount Decl., Exhibit A
16	Salgado's termination, and notified Salgado of his right to appeal the decision.	(Salgado dep. Tr. 85:18-25)
17		DISPUTED BY PLAINTIFF
18	26. Salgado's termination became effective on August 24, 2004.	26. Baker Decl. ¶ 15; Fox Decl. ¶4
19		NOT DISPUTED BY PLAINTIFF
20	27. Salgado declined to appeal his termination.	27. Fox Decl. ¶ 6; Exhibit B; Mount
21		Decl., Exhibit A (Salgado 109:11-24)
22		DISPUTED BY PLAINTIFF
23		J.G. GILD DIT LAMINI
24	28. After Salgado was terminated, on October	28. Mount Decl. ¶4, Exhibit C
25	13, 2004, he was convicted of five counts of felony violation of Penal Code section 118.5	(Salgado Rev. Supp. Resp. to Req. For Admission No. 3)
25	for knowingly and intentionally filing a false	requirer hamiltoner (40. 5)
26	report be a peace officer.	NOT DISPUTED BY PLAINTIFF
27		
28		
1		

1	38. Salgado admits that the C a common law action for i	ity is immune from	38. Mount Decl. ¶ 4; Exhibit C
2	of emotional distress.	ntentional infliction	(Salgado Rev. Supp. Resp. to Req. for Admissions No. 1)
3			NOT DISPUTED BY PLAINTIFF
4			
5	Dated: June 28, 2006	Meyers, Na	ave, Riback, Silver & Wilson
6			
7		By <u>/S/</u> Kath	KATHY E. MOUNT 06/28/2006
8		Atto	ny E. Mount rney for Defendants
9	840282v1; 1029.4005		
10	·		
11			
12			
13			
14			•
15			
16			
17			
18			
19 20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			
:	Separate Statement of Undisputed Material Fact	s in	Huppert/Salgado v. City of Pittsburg, et a